

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

January 11, 1979  
9:00 A.M.

Council Chambers  
301 West Second Street

---

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Pro Tem Cooke presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Mayor Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau,  
Mullen, Snell, Trevino

Absent: Mayor McClellan

INVOCATION

Reverend Merle Franke, First English Lutheran Church, gave the Invocation.

THINK TREES WEEK

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke read a proclamation designating the week of January 14-20, 1979, as Think Trees Week in Austin and called on all residents of Austin to join with Mrs. Hofmann in this worthwhile project by planting trees and preserving our most important natural resource. MRS. MARGRET HOFMANN accepted the proclamation and thanked the Council.

HUMAN RELATIONS DAY

Councilmember Snell read a proclamation designating Monday, January 15, 1979, as Human Relations Day in Austin in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. MS. EARLENE WRIGHT accepted the proclamation and thanked the Council.

## PURPLE MARTIN TIME IN AUSTIN

MIKE THOMASSON was in the Council Chamber to accept a proclamation read by Mayor Pro Tem Cooke designating the week of January 14-20, 1979 as Purple Martin Time in Austin, and thanked the Council.

## MINUTES APPROVED

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council approve the Minutes for Special Meetings of December 21, 1978 and January 3, 1979, and Regular Meeting of January 4, 1979. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Snell, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmember Trevino

## CONTRACTS APPROVED

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

DELTA MACHINE COMPANY, INC.  
8561 Long Point  
Houston, Texas

- Repair of Water Pump, Water and  
Wastewater Utility - \$8,960.00

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

SCHMIDT CONSTRUCTION COMPANY  
U. S. Highway 290 West  
Austin, Texas

- CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM -  
Construction of 8-inch wastewater  
main in North Meadows Phase III-B -  
\$31,865.10 CIP No. 73/50-02

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

THE EDWARDS GROUP, INC.  
3001 LBJ, Suite 206  
Dallas, Texas

- Control Systems and Actuarial Services, Health Department.  
Five (5) week contract followed by two (2) additional days during subsequent three months - \$19,800.00

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

DALMARK, INC.  
Route 1, Brandt Lane  
Austin, Texas

- CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM -  
Construction of electric conduit system and streetlight foundations for Millwood, Section Three -  
\$40,449.00 CIP Nos. 75/30-01 and 75/36-01

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION  
201 North St. Mary's Street  
San Antonio, Texas

- CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM -  
Two Network Transformers and four Network Protectors, Electric Department - \$76,956.00  
CIP No. 75/30-02

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1600 NE Loop 410  
San Antonio, Texas

- CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM -  
Power Line Carrier Communication  
System, Electric Department.  
Item 1 - \$238,909.44

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

#### PROFESSIONAL SOILS INVESTIGATION

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution selecting the firm of Snowden and Meyer, Inc., for Professional Soils Investigation, Engineering Testing and Structural (Foundation) Design Services for Pilot Knob, Lytton Springs and Holman Substations. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM Nos. 77/35-06, 77/35-05 and 78/35-01. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

#### RAILROAD ADVANCE WARNING SIGNALS

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution entering into an Agreement with the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation for the operation and maintenance of the overhead railroad advance warning signals on Oltorf Street at Missouri Pacific Railroad. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

## APD DELINQUENCY PREVENTION OFFICERS

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing submission of a Texas Criminal Justice Division Project entitled "APD Delinquency Prevention Officers" in the amount of \$52,692.00 with a local cash match requirement of \$13,173.00, from March 1, 1980 through February 28, 1981. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

## GREATER AUSTIN AREA ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL UNIT

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing submission of a Texas Criminal Justice Division Project entitled, "Greater Austin Area Organized Crime Control Unit" in the amount of \$137,767.00 with a local cash match requirement of \$234,929.00 from November 1, 1979 through October 31, 1980. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Himmelblau asked "Where is the local match coming from?" Chief Frank Dyson of the Police Department answered, "That's really in-kind match. It's the salary for the Austin Police Officers who are assigned to that unit and those salaries of course will be approved whether the grant is approved or not."

## LICENSE AGREEMENT

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution cancelling and/or revising the License Agreement for a recycling depot on West 23rd granted to Michael Kleinman, representing Youth Emergency Services, Inc., on December 14, 1978, and also to reimburse fee to Kleinman. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Goodman asked that the following letter regarding this matter be entered into the record:

January 11, 1979

Dr. Susan Wittig and I met on January 4, 1979 with Mr. Michael Kleinman of Youth Emergency Services and with Ms. Betty Phillips of Save University Neighborhood. I am happy to report that during this meeting we were able to reach an agreement regarding the "Recycling Depot." Points of the agreement are as follows:

1. The Co-op will provide space on our property at the corner of San Antonio and 23rd Streets for a Recycling Depot.
2. The Co-op will pay for the structure initially, but Youth Emergency Services will reimburse the Co-op for the cost incurred.
3. Youth Emergency Services will maintain the Depot and the esthetics of the structure to the satisfaction of the University Co-op and the neighborhood. Failure to do so will void this agreement.
4. The structure will meet existing City Codes.
5. The wooden structure currently located in front of the Co-op's Bike Shop will be removed by Youth Emergency Services as soon as the weather permits.

I am requesting that the City Council support this agreement, revoke the temporary license agreement issued to Mr. Kleinman, and refund to him the money he has paid in his attempt to secure a license.

Dr. Wittig talked with Mrs. Schoch and Mrs. Schoch has given her support to the relocation of the Depot.

John, please inform members of the City Council of our appreciation for their understanding and interest in this important project.

Sincerely,

*Gerald L. Matthews*

Gerald L. Matthews, President  
University Co-Operative Society

Agreed to by:

*Michael Kleinman*  
Michael Kleinman  
Youth Emergency Services

*pending*

*YES Board approval*

## INTERLOCAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the Counties of Burnet, Lampasas and Williamson and other municipalities of Round Rock and Cedar Park to become parties to the Interlocal Assistance Agreement, creating the Greater Austin Area Organized Crime Control Unit. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

## APPROACH MAIN POLICY

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution revising the approach main policy to require additional approval by Council if the City's cost share increases by ten percent or more. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

## BULL CREEK APPROACH MAIN

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing an agreement relating to the Bull Creek Lateral "A" Approach Main. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

## ANNEXATION AUTHORIZATION

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution amending the resolution authorizing the annexation of 208 acres into Williamson County Municipal Utility District No. 1. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Mayor Pro Tem  
Cooke, Councilmember Goodman  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Councilmember Trevino  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

## SPEED ZONE MODIFICATION

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SUBSECTIONS (c) AND (d) OF SECTION 21-42 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967, MAKING CERTAIN DELETIONS AND ADDITIONS TO SAID SUBSECTIONS, THEREBY DECLARING THE MAXIMUM PRIMA FACIE SPEED LIMITS UPON CERTAIN STREETS AND HIGHWAYS WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, PURSUANT TO AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE "UNIFORM ACT REGULATING TRAFFIC ON HIGHWAYS" (VERNON'S ANN. CIV. ST., ART 6701d); REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT WITH THIS ORDINANCE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem  
Cooke, Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Speed zones are as follows:

DELETE: Subsection d - 50 mph.

<u>ON</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>
East Martin L. King Jr. Boulevard (FM 969)	Airport Boulevard (Station 0 + 60) 3100 Block	276 feet east of Spring- dale Road (Station 71 + 22) 4600 Block
East Martin Luther King Jr., Boulevard (FM 969)	Airport Boulevard 3000 Block	Scottsdale Road, 4900 Block
ADD: Subsection c - 45 mph		
East Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard (FM 969)	Airport Boulevard (Station 0 + 00) 3000 Block	27 feet west of J. J. Seabrook (Station 42 + 65) 4000 Block
ADD: Subsection d - 50 mph		
East Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard (FM 969)	27 feet west of J. J. Seabrook Drive (Station 42 + 65) 4000 Block	276 feet east of Spring- dale Road (Station 71 + 22) 4600 Block



## STREET NAME CHANGE

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE NAME OF THOSE CERTAIN PORTIONS OF ATKINSON ROAD THAT HAVE BEEN REALIGNED BY SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT TO CAMINO LA COSTA; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

## ANNEXATIONS

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 127.87 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE T. J. CHAMBERS GRANT IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The ordinance was read the second time, and Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for the third reading, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan  
Abstained: Councilmember Trevino

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 96.00 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE THEODORE BISSEL LEAGUE IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The ordinance was read the second time, and Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for the third reading, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Abstained: Councilmember Trevino

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 45.86 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE JOHN C. BROOKS SURVEY IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The ordinance was read the second time, and Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for the third reading, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Abstained: Councilmember Trevino

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 72.07 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE HENRY P. HILL LEAGUE IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The ordinance was read the second time, and Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for the third reading, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Abstained: Councilmember Trevino

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 14.127 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE T. J. CHAMBERS GRANT IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The ordinance was read the second time, and Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council waive the requirement for the third reading, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor McClellan

Abstained: Councilmember Trevino

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

"GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROCESS" CHAPTER IV

Mr. Dick Lillie, Director of Planning, presented to Council the following report from the Planning Commission:

"The Planning Commission is pleased to submit the "Growth Management Process," Chapter IV of the Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan to you. The City Council approved the Comprehensive Plan in April, 1977, with the instructions that a growth pattern termed "Directed Growth and Inner-City Expansion" become the basis for growth management described in Chapter IV. Chapter IV was rewritten to reflect this pattern and has been reviewed by the Austin Tomorrow Ongoing Committee, the Environmental Board, and by citizens at a public hearing.

It is important to note that Chapter IV does not stand by itself; rather it is an integral part of the entire Comprehensive Plan which is divided into four chapters as follows:

Chapter I - "Introduction" provides a history of the Comprehensive Plan and recaps the Austin Tomorrow Goals Program.

Chapter II - "Goals, Objectives, and Policies" is comprised of statements which provide development and improvement guidelines on eight functional topics.

Chapter III - "Development Suitability" describes the implications of urbanization and suburbanization with Austin's environmental context. The synthesis of environmental suitability and the goals in Chapter II yield developmental limitations which form the basis for growth management.

Chapter IV - "Growth Management Process" establishes a desired physical pattern and priorities for the City's future development.

"The Planning Commission agrees that Chapter IV, as written, is an accurate reflection of the adopted growth pattern, "Directed Growth and Inner-City Expansion." This growth management process encourages development in the central city and within the environmentally suitable growth corridor. It recognizes that a certain amount of development will occur outside the corridor despite city influence and offers policies to control the nature of such development. It is intended to provide guidelines for decisions that are flexible and responsive to the changing needs of the community."

Mr. Lillie continued with a summary of Comprehensive Plan Chapter IV, as follows:

"The growth management process of Chapter IV derives from the preceeding two chapters of the Comprehensive Plan, which state goals, objectives and policies, and analyze environmental suitability and development limitations.

"One of the dominant themes of Chapter II, "Goals, Objectives, and Policies," is the need for a growth management process to influence urban development in the direction of these goals. The City Council approved the Comprehensive Plan in April 1977 with the instructions that a growth pattern termed "Directed Growth and Inner-City Expansion" become the basis for the growth management process of Chapter IV. The Austin Tomorrow Ongoing Committee and the Planning Commission have responded to that directive with this rewriting of Chapter IV. The selected pattern recognizes environmentally preferable locations for urban growth, and emphasizes revitalization of the core area, and preservation of neighborhoods. It also recognizes, however, that a certain amount of development will occur in the less desirable areas despite City influence.

"Six categories of "growth areas" are used to designate land resources in and around Austin according to development suitability in terms of the Comprehensive Plan. The first three categories are called growth "priority" areas.

Area I, the central city, should receive the highest priority for municipal investment and incentives for efficient land uses.

Area II, which is outside the core area but inside the 1977 boundaries of the incorporated City, receives second highest priority for urban development.

Area III is comprised of land outside the 1977 City limits but within the designated north-south corridor of highest development suitability.

"The remaining three growth areas have comparatively severe environmental constraints to development.

Area IV consists of regions outside the environmentally suitable corridor which are already experiencing high levels of development activity, and to which the City and/or State have made commitments for the provision of infrastructure. These regions will be included in the City's growth pattern for the purpose of insuring orderly, regulated growth, although their priority for City facilities and services should be lower than that land within the first three growth areas.

Area V is an interim classification for certain lands which require further study prior to determination of appropriate policies. At that time the lands will be assigned to either Area IV or Area VI. Area V is comprised of several regions west of the desired growth corridor which are experiencing or are expected to experience, considerable development pressures, but for which few public infrastructure commitments have been made.

Area VI lies outside the first five growth area. In terms of attaining the goals and objectives of the Plan, land of this designation is least desirable for urban expansion.

"A procedure is proposed for incrementally monitoring and evaluating the progress toward implementation of the selected growth pattern, citizen's goals, and the Plan. This procedure includes schedules for adjustments and revisions. Chapter IV also recognizes the importance of capital improvements programming to growth management, and lists policies to which the CIP should conform."

Mr. Lillie then referred Council to a recommendation made by the Planning Commission this week in the form of Commission minutes. He said it is important as Council looks at the annexation plan and also the Davenport Ranch request for M.U.D. and M.U.D. policy. Recommendation is as follows from the Commission minutes:

"Planning Commission---Austin, Tx.

January 9, 1979

R200      Consideration of Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Stoll moved to reconsider the motion passed at the meeting of January 8 to leave Area V as an interim classification pending further study. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. The motion to reconsider passed.

Mr. Stoll stated he wanted to give the Council direction as to whether or not Area V should be upgraded to Area IV or downgraded to Area VI. He felt the area southwest of the city should be in Area VI and the area northwest of the City should be in Area IV.

The Commission discussed Mr. Stoll's proposal. Several members felt that the decision on the classification of Area V should be made on a case-by-case basis rather than setting an overall policy for the entire area at this time.

COMMISSION VOTE

Mr. Vier moved to recommend Subarea 32 and 33, as identified in the Annexation Plan, be placed in Area VI and to inform the Council the Planning Commission will continue to study the remainder of Area V and make recommendations on completion of further study. Mrs. Schechter seconded the motion.

AYE: Danze, Guerrero, Jagger, Schechter, Shipman, Snyder, Stoll,  
and Vier

ABSENT: Dixon

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 8-0."

Mr. Lillie explained that Area V is west of the lake and north of Westlake Hills and extending south of Westlake Hills on 290 west of the City.

Mr. Lillie continued, "The other item which was recommended by the Legal Department and adopted by the Planning Commission was a point in the chapter that dealt with Area VI where the language was in all other areas the City would participate in oversize lines for utilities. In Area VI, which is the lowest priority, the language was "availability of municipal intra-structure only at the full cost to the developer" which meant that he had not only paid for his own but also all the oversize which the City participates in in all other areas. The Legal Department found a problem with that and recommended an amendment to the language, in which the statement reads the City will not spend any funds on intra-structure Area VI but that if someone wanted to make an application for service, the City had three options:

1. Disapprove the application and let the developer proceed with other service options;
2. City approve the application only to the size the developer needs; or,
3. The City could consider amending the plan to allow the oversize and participate.

The Planning was satisfied with that suggestion and did make a recommendation to Council to consider it.

"Other statements in this document that deal with the Capital Improvements and decisions that you will make in your annexation plan on the 22nd include statements like 'independent utility districts within Austin's ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction) should be discouraged where the City is capable of providing service.'" Councilmember Himmelblau asked, "What about the State then giving O.K.'s on private water districts...we've seen two in the last five of six years. How can we block that?" Mr. De La Rosa, Assistant City Attorney, stated, "The one thing that comes to mind off hand is that we could go to the Public Utility Commission and apply for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity to grant us authorization to serve that particular area which would block any private company." There was further discussion by Council concerning Chapter IV. Councilmember Goodman suggested they postpone decision for the time being as he thought Council needed more time to look it over. Mayor Pro Tem Cooke strongly advised Council to put a time frame on when this should be brought back.

#### Motion

Councilmember Trevino moved that the Council postpone until January 18, 1979, consideration of "Growth Management Process" Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Mullen  
Noes: None  
Absent: Mayor McClellan

## THOROUGHBRED ESTATES SUBDIVISION

Mr. Leroy Lange who had requested an appearance before Council to discuss approval of the preliminary plat on the Thoroughbred Estates Subdivision did not appear. The staff is working toward an agreement on approval of the preliminary plat.

## RECYCLING DEPOT

Dr. and Mrs. Eugene Schoch, Dr. Susan Wittig and Jerry Matthews, who had requested to appear before Council to discuss recent approval of a recycling depot on 23rd Street, did not appear. This was considered during approval of resolution E.7 on the Agenda (resolution on license agreement for recycling depot on West 23rd Street).

At this time, Mayor McClellan entered the Council Chamber and presided.

## PUBLIC HEARING ON BARTON CREEK INTERIM CONTROLS

Mayor McClellan opened the public hearing scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on Barton Creek Interim Controls.

Dr. Maureen McReynolds, Director of the Environmental Resource Management Department for the City of Austin, spoke first, saying that a representative from the Environmental Board was scheduled to be here this morning to make a presentation but did not make it, so she gave a brief presentation. She said that the Environmental Board has recommended to Council that development controls such as the Lake Austin controls be developed and extended to the Barton Creek Watershed.

MR. MAURY HOOD, Chairman of the Citizens Planning Committee of the Environmental Review Board, arrived at this time and addressed Council as follows:

"The Citizens' Board of Natural Resources and Environmental Quality urges the City Council to adopt an interim controls ordinance for development within the Barton Creek watershed as it has done to protect the Lake Austin watershed.

Briefly, the major provisions of the Lake Austin Interim Controls include the following:

1. Requirements specifying the information to be submitted by the applicant.
2. Provisions for storm water detention facilities and erosion control measures if required.
3. Restriction on location of and clearing for roadways.



4. Restrictions on location of and grading for building sites and driveways (with cut and fill limitations, erosion control, restoration and slope stabilization requirements).
5. Impervious cover limitations correlated with slope.
6. Provisions that allow alternative methods that would deviate from the strict application of the ordinance, but retain the objectives of the ordinance.

The purpose of these provisions is to regulate development in a way that will preserve the water quality of Lake Austin. To a large extent the Lake Austin standards constitute sound planning and development principles for water quality protection that could apply in any sensitive watershed. Barton Creek is a sensitive watershed and water quality protection is desirable. Water quality of the Barton Creek watershed is considered by many as important an issue as the water quality of the Lake Austin watershed for three reasons. First, the water quality of Barton Creek and Barton Springs is comparable to, and for some characteristics is better than that of Lake Austin, which in some areas already shows signs of water quality degradation due to development.

Second, the recreational market offered by Barton Springs Pool, which attracts about one-quarter million people a year, and the recreational value of the creek itself are important amenities to the City. Third, the possibility of contamination of the underground water of the Edwards Formation is a major concern because of the many unknowns about the permeability of the Formation and its ability for self-purification. The possible effects that urban runoff in Barton Creek or exfiltration of sewage may have on the Edwards Water and subsequently on the Springs are not known. If the Edwards become contaminated, it is not know how long it may take for it to become clean again.

There is one significant difference between the two watersheds. Lake Austin is the major source of the City's drinking water supply. Although Barton Creek and other creeks that empty into the upper reaches of Town Lake do contribute to the City's water supply, the Water and Wastewater Department does not regard them as a major source of drinking water. Consequently, the legal authority for protection of these water resources is different from the authority for Lake Austin. Development controls should be considred as a part of the City's overall program of water quality protection and urban runoff control. (See attached resolution from Environmental Board.)

The Lake Austin standards should provide an adequate interim control until more specific Barton Creek controls are developed. Considering the geologic and soil similarities of the two watersheds, the application of Lake Austin controls to the Barton Creek watershed seem not only appropriate, but necessary at this time.

The Environmental Board therefore recommends that the City Council amend Chapter 41, the Subdivision Ordinance, to provide development controls in the Barton Creek watershed within the City limits and ETJ. We further recommend that Chapter 29 be amended to provide water quality controls for land in the Barton Creek watershed inside the City limits."

Mr. Hood reported as follows on Urban Storm Water Runoff Control:

"The Citizens' Board of Natural Resources and Environmental Quality recommends that the City Council officially adopt an urban storm water runoff control program for sensitive watersheds within the City of Austin's corporate limits and extraterritorial jurisdiction. State enabling legislation, Section 21.357 of the Texas Water Code, exists which authorizes municipalities to develop comprehensive water pollution control programs for the protection of their water resources inside the extraterritorial areas. The City of Austin has already demonstrated its concern in this area by entering into an agreement with the United States Geological Survey for a cooperative water data program for the South Austin Metropolitan Area and for the Balcones Fault Zones.

Therefore, we urge the Council to commit the City of Austin to a continued, long-range urban storm water runoff control program for all Austin area creeks. Through review and study of these waterways, sound policies and techniques can be employed to reduce or avoid the adverse environmental impact of urban storm water runoff on the existing water quality of our creeks."

STEVE HANSON, Secretary of the Austin Sierra Club, said, "I agree with Mr. Hood also, not only Barton Creek but Edwards Aquifer. Cloudy water comes through the aquifer from somewhere and we need to find out where it is coming from."

HERNDON WILLIAMS, Secretary of the Barton Springs-Horseshoe Bend Neighborhood Association spoke in support of Barton Creek Interim Controls and stated chemical monitoring of Barton Springs should be established.

MARILYN SIMPSON, Coordinator of the Austin Neighborhood Council, spoke saying that she is in favor of extending Interim Controls to Lake Austin Watershed. She also agrees with a monitoring system and urged passage of Interim Controls now.

MARY LEA of the Travis Audubon Society, expressed her views in favor of applying Interim Controls now.

MYFIE MOORE, speaking for "We Care Austin", addressed the Council, saying their members feel Barton Creek and Zilker Park are this community's most unique natural asset. Therefore, she joined with the Environmental Board in requesting to extend the Lake Austin development standards to the Barton Creek Watershed now.

NANCY BENE, President of the Barton Creek Neighborhood Association, asked Council to please adopt the Interim Controls for Barton Creek Watershed.

JEFF MATTOX, President of the Barton Creek Property Owners Association, said his concern is the development standards the City of Austin has for two mile extraterritorial jurisdiction in relationship to the Interim Standards that Council wants to put in Barton Creek. He stated the controls the City has on curbs and gutters in developments does not necessarily entertain pure water runoff. There needs to be some attention addressed to that matter as to how it effects the quality of Barton Creek or any other creek. He added that some of the City's criteria is not environmentally feasible.

Councilmember Himmelblau spoke at this time saying she hates to hear him say that and added she knows the City goes the two miles with urban standards and has been hoping the City would go the entire five miles with urban standards and feels it would mean a great deal financially to the City when we annex.

City Manager Dan Davidson at this time stated there are a number of the concerns which Mr. Mattox mentioned being studied by various City Departments and the studies are expected to be completed within thirty to forty-five days. Mr. Davidson said they would see that Mr. Mattox' comments are taken into consideration.

RUTH EPSTEIN, representing the Travis County Democratic Women, asked Council to extend the Lake Austin Interim Controls to the Barton Creek Watershed. She said that both zoning and environmental rules are needed to protect sensitive areas.

Councilmember Goodman asked Mr. Dick Lillie, Director of the Planning Department, if there is a fiscal note attached to this and what would be the cost of implementation. Mr. Lillie referred the question to Dr. McReynolds, who said there is no fiscal note attached, and the ordinances have not been drawn up. The public hearing was scheduled to review this particular issue. The Legal Department is currently working on converting the Lake Austin Ordinance to the Barton Creek area.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke suggested the public hearing be continued so as to bring back discussion by the people who are interested and have already spoken, plus give others with more specifics a chance to speak. Councilmember Himmelblau at this point stated this is a public hearing we are having now.

Dr. McReynolds said that copies of Chapters 41 and 29 have been distributed to all those who have asked and they have been informed the specific recommendations were that those would be the controls. The problem with drawing up the specific ordinance for adoption has been a matter of organizing the sections and getting the numbers correct and that sort of thing which has to be done by the Legal Department. If it is the intention of the Council to adopt those specific controls the staff can bring them back at the next meeting in ordinance form.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke said if we are talking about an area of land that is different than what is in Chapters 41 and 29 and if modifications are to be made by the Legal Department, then he would have some concerns. Mr. De La Rosa, Assistant City Attorney, assured Mr. Cooke that it is basically the same.

#### Motion

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke moved that the Council have brought to it in ordinance form a request that the Lake Austin Interim Controls be applied to Barton Creek. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mullen.

Councilmember Goodman asked if the Lake Austin Ordinance has been smoothly and efficiently implemented, and what kind of a guide will that be?

Dr. McReynolds answered staff is in the process of preparing a report based on our first year's experience with the Lake Austin Ordinance which will be ready for the Council in approximately thirty days, and that will include any recommendations we feel will be pertinent for any mid-term corrections. Mayor McClellan commented that was the point she was trying to make.

Councilmember Himmelblau asked how many monitoring stations are in operation now for water quality checks. Dr. McReynolds answered, two. Councilmember Himmelblau then asked if there is any evidence of more nutrients as far as the runoff goes, to which Dr. McReynolds said, "We haven't been able to say that conclusively yet. There were several incidents in the reports done by the Water Quality Board that did indicate that in the urbanized areas the nutrient level was higher, but in each case they felt there were many other extenuating circumstances that could not definitely be associated with urban runoff."

Councilmember Goodman asked if there are any major problems with the ordinance and if it is working. Mr. Lillie said the ordinance is working and not one subdivision has been denied. Several have gone to alternate methods that have been reviewed by the Environmental office and our Engineering Department. There is a greater degree of engineering that has to take place earlier in the process. The density of subdivisions is slightly less than it was prior to the initiation of the ordinance.

Councilmember Mullen asked if Mr. Lillie had any idea how many have gone to alternate methods. Mr. Lillie answered six or twelve out of fifty. Councilmember Mullen said that was an interesting analogy.

Mayor McClellan asked Dr. McReynolds how long the Lake Austin Interim ordinance would run. Dr. McReynolds answered, February 1980.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke thought a fiscal note was needed to be brought back with the ordinance when it comes back to Council. He also said he would like Council to look at the Urban Storm Runoff Control program.

Councilmember Mullen stated, "If the report shows the need for modifications, the ordinance can be amended later on."

Mr. Lillie commented, "If anyone needs information regarding the Urban Storm Runoff, the monitoring program, and the E.P.A. grant, these questions can be directed to Mr. Graves." Mr. Graves said he would like to be made aware of it.

#### Roll Call on Motion

Roll call on Mayor Pro Tem Cooke's motion, Councilmember Mullen's second, to bring back to Council in ordinance form a request that the Lake Austin Interim Controls be applied to Barton Creek, showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell  
Noes: None

Mr. Charles Graves, City Engineer, advised Council there is one shaping up very rapidly and it will be included in the report Mr. Lillie referred to. The E.P.A. has taken note of what Austin is doing in the Lake Austin Interim

ordinance. They have awarded a grant through the Texas Department of Water Resources to make LCRA the project matter on Urban Storm Water Runoff study for four years, and it accomplishes exactly what we want to do in the monitoring. The City will have input and there will be no cost to the City. Part of the purpose is to test the transferability of that data not only to Barton Creek and other areas of Austin but to all the United States. It is a very significant project.

#### VIET NAM WAR VETERANS MONUMENT

COL. LAWSON MAGRUDER, Austin Chapter Military Order of World Wars, appeared before Council to request placement of a monument in memory of Viet Nam War Veterans to be located in the southwest area of Waterloo Park off East 12th Street and Trinity Street. He told Council the citizens of Austin will be asked to donate toward the monument which will cost approximately \$10,000. Col. Magruder indicated the dedication goal is for November 11, 1979.

Mayor McClellan thanked him for bringing this to Council's attention and applauded his efforts. She told him the monument would bring an added dimension to the Central City area. Mayor Pro Tem Cooke stated he, as a Viet Nam veteran, endorses the monument.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke moved that the Council approve the placement of a monument in memory of Viet Nam War Veterans, to be located in the southwest area of Waterloo Park off East 12th Street and Trinity Street. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor McClellan, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmembers  
Goodman, Himmelblau, Mullen, Snell, Trevino  
Noes: None

Councilmember Goodman said, "The Viet Nam veteran, because the Viet Nam war was so unpopular, came back and was considered almost like an enemy. He felt alienated from society and I think this is a proper acknowledgement. Just because it was an unpopular war, they do not deserve an unpopular status."

#### MEETINGS RESCHEDULED

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council reschedule the Council meeting set for 7:00 p.m., Thursday, January 18, 1979, to 9:00 a.m., Thursday, January 18, 1979. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau,  
Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan  
Noes: None

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council reschedule the Municipal Utility District and Annexation Study from 7:00 p.m., January 18, 1979, to 6:00 p.m., January 31, 1979; and set the public hearing on the closing of Matthews Lane for 7:00 p.m., May 17, 1979. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Cooke, Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau,  
Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan  
Noes: None

## RESOLUTION TO HOMER REED

Mayor McClellan read and presented the following Resolution to Mr. Homer Reed, Deputy City Manager, who is resigning effective January 15, 1979. It was signed by all members of the Council:

"WHEREAS, Homer Reed has brought a broad range of technical expertise and professional demeanor to his position as Deputy City Manager for the City of Austin; and

WHEREAS, Homer Reed has provided the citizens of Austin with efficient, dutiful, and dedicated service, putting his position in the forefront of sacrifice from his home and family, through long hours at his office desk; and

WHEREAS, his faithful attention to his responsibilities have been a credit to this City, its administrative team, its elected officials, and most of all, to himself; and

WHEREAS, his achievements and his successes will continue to live in a chrestomathy of established municipal programs, benefitting citizens of the future as they have citizens of today.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS:

That Homer Reed has served the citizens of Austin with an honest and devoted loyalty, giving of his time and energies toward maintaining a quality community; that Homer Reed has resigned his position as Deputy City Manager effective January 15, 1979, for other goals; that we call on all citizens to join us in this expression of appreciation for a job well done; and that we direct that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the City Council of Austin, Texas.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands and caused the Great Seal of the City of Austin to be affixed, this the 11th day of January, 1979, A. D."

Mr. Reed expressed his appreciation to Mayor and Council for the Resolution and spoke of his years as an employee for the City of Austin, citing his good feelings toward the City and fellow employees.

FISCAL YEAR END SUMMARIES FOR GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS  
AND NON-UTILITY ENTERPRISE FUNDS

Council had before it a City Manager Report on "Presentation on Fiscal Year End Summaries for Governmental Funds and the Non-Utility Enterprise Funds." Mr. Monty Nitcholas, Finance Director, highlighted the report. Transcript of the proceedings is as follows:

"NITCHOLAS: Before I get into the reports you have received in your packet, I'd like to talk to you just a little bit about the reports themselves and about how we laid them out and why we did it that way. The summary report that you have are specifically designed for management analysis and they are not technically considered accounting reports. They are not balance sheets, they are not profit and loss statements, but they are management type reports. They do provide you with the same type information you would get in a profit and loss summary, except that these are laid out in a format that is very similar to what the budget is laid in.

We have divided the reporting for the year end because there are so many different types of funds and so many funds in the City government. We've grouped these into three separate operating categories. The first one is the General Government category which includes the General Fund and the funds that are unique to governmental entities and normally are not business type operations.

The second group is the non-utility enterprise funds. These include the businesses that the City is involved in with the exception of the utility. We felt the utility was a large enough operation of its own that it deserved a grouping of its very own. So that's the third group and that particular group is not, or that particular report is not complete yet and we hope to have it to you next week. At the latest the week after.

I would like to go through these reports. They are summary type reports and I will go through them briefly, but I would like you to if you would, follow the schedules and we will go through them one by one. Each one of these two groups that you have today has a financial summary of all of the funds in that group to give you a look at what the general government area did this year and to give you a look at what the non-utility businesses did this year. So we will look at them as a group first and then as individual funds following that.

In the governmental operating funds which I said includes the general fund and also includes the general debt fund, general obligation debt service fund, the transit fund, the EMS fund, the computer acquisition fund, the medical assistance funds. Those are all grouped in this category.

On Schedule I, you'll see the beginning available balance is the budget balance we talk about. The beginning available balance was originally estimated to be \$8.7 million dollars. That beginning balance was computed back in June of 1977. It was an estimate at the time when it went into the budget. That actual beginning balance was \$10,000,000 for those funds which means that was \$1.2 million more than was originally budgeted. The revenues for this group of funds exceeded the budget amount by \$1.4 million during the year 1977-78. The budget estimate being \$61.2 million approximately. The actual amount \$62.6 million.

So you have a \$1.4 million increase in revenues above the original budget. When I talk about the budget I talk about the original approved budget, not the amended budget, but the budget that was adopted back before the year began. The incoming transfers into the governmental funds netted out were \$2,500,000 above the original budget. Mostly this came from the Utility Fund transfer and from the Capital Projects transfer of some FAA money that went to the service funds, but the basic ingredient of that \$2,500,000 is the Utility Fund transfer to the General Fund. The budget estimate for these incoming transfers originally was \$26.9 million. Actually we transferred \$29.4 million for an increase of \$2,500,000.

Actual expenditures, a very important item. This is what the budget really is all about at the bottom line. Actual expenditures for operation, debt, special services and capital equipment were \$1.4 million under the original budget. The major area of these underruns was in the operating cost category. The original budget estimated we would spend \$79.9 million in those areas. We actually spent \$78.5 million. So we were \$1.4 million under budget for the total General Government operation.

Outgoing transfers were \$1.6 million less than were originally budgeted. The major factor in this being the hospital fund transfer that required \$4.9 million rather than \$7.7 million that was originally budgeted. The budget estimate originally was \$8,000,000. The actual was \$6.4 million, so we were \$1.6 million under. When we put these things together we can see that resources were estimated to exceed originally all expenditures and subsidies by \$74,000,000. Actually, at the end of the year, these funds...that total expenditure was \$7.1 million less than the resources generated during the year 1977-78. The new resources that came in through revenues and transfers were \$3.9 million more than budgeted. The disposition of those revenues, which is the expenditures was \$3 million less than originally budgeted. The net increase went to the fund balance to help increase the fund balance with \$7 million.

The second schedule is the schedule of the General Fund which is the General Operating Fund, a part of this whole governmental operating activity. This is the big factor in the operating...in the governmental operating fund. In the General Fund revenues were \$52.9 million. They were up \$1,380,000 over the original projection which was \$51.5 million. The major factor involved in this increase revenue for the year was in City sales tax and the mixed drink tax. Offsetting part of the increase in the City sales tax was somewhat of a short fall in the franchise gross receipts tax because a projected 4% gross receipts tax on Southern Union did not materialize as it was projected. But revenues are \$1,380,000 more than was projected in General Fund.

Transfers in were \$26 million. They exceeded the original projection of \$24.9 million by almost \$1.2 million. Again, due for the most part from an increase in the Utility Fund transfers. Expenditures in the General Fund were \$64.2 million. This was down \$1,849,000 from the original estimate of \$66,000,000. So expenditures in the General Fund were less than had been anticipated in the original budget. Transfers out of the General Fund were \$8 million. That's \$1.9 million less than the original budget of \$9.9 million. Even though transfer amounts increased in certain areas...EMS activities and capital projects, the reduced amounts necessary to meet hospital and transit operations were substantial and they provided the significant decrease in the overall transfer of the



General Fund. So, the General Fund, the variable balance at the beginning of the year was \$1.4 million higher than was projected, back in June or July of the previous year when we projected that. The annual activity during the year, resources versus expenditures; transfers in versus transfers out, total, produce \$6.5 million. So we have \$6.5 million more resources in the General Fund, that were generated during the year than were spent. The ending balance rose from a projected \$3.3 million to a substantial \$10.9 million figure. The ending balance originally projected from the original adoption of the budget was \$3.3 million.

COOKE: Actually it was down about a million over that, right? We made amendments to the budget over the year of about \$1,000,000.

NITCHOLAS: Yes. I don't have that figure of what the amendments were during the year.

COOKE: I have it.

NITCHOLAS: Yes, we have those numbers, but this report is based on original budget versus...

COOKE: You said that at the outset.

NITCHOLAS: Yes. In the next schedule is the General Obligation Debt Service Fund. I won't spend a lot of time on that. It's a legally established fund. One that has to be done to pay our bonds back. It reflects in the main monies that were set aside to pay for debt requirements during the year. It further reflects the investment interest that was earned off of those monies and the disposition of that cash from the investments of the General Fund. One unusual occurrence this year during the year 1977-78 was the receipt of \$433,000 from the FAA that represents a Federal Grant from a previous construction cost and the grant was required to be put into the debt service. It could not be used for any new construction.

The next schedule, the Transit Fund, this fund reflects only the net cost to the City. It doesn't go into the contractors' revenues and expenditures but it only reflects the net cost to the City for the contractual operation of the transportation system.

HIMMELBLAU: Monty, on this one are we not expecting some more Federal money back?

NITCHOLAS: Yes, and some of that Federal money that we're expecting back is included in here. We set it up as a receivable because we did bill UMTA for that money. I don't have that number exactly, Mrs. Himmelblau, but I'm thinking there's about a half million dollars that we haven't billed yet.

HIMMELBLAU: That's about where I put it.

NITCHOLAS: If we hadn't had that we would have actually had to increase the subsidy of the Transit System this year rather than decrease it. But because we had that from General Government, of City funds, because we did have that, even though we have not received the cash on some of those yet, we have encumbered those and were able to reduce the General Fund subsidy of the Transit System.

In the next schedule, Schedule V, the Emergency Medical Services Fund, revenues from service charges and contractual agreements were somewhat short of the original estimate about \$24,000. Cost increase, \$129,000 over the budget estimate, and this increase was covered by General Fund transfer of a total of \$203,000 at year end as compared to an estimated \$15,000 in the original budget. Revenue sharing funds had been used, were budgeted to be used at \$1.1 million that year and were used in that amount.

HIMMELBLAU: Do you know where we sit with bad debt on this fund?

NITCHOLAS: No, but the revenues that were shown in here are based on the receivable and the bad debt is taken out. A reserve for bad debts is reduced.

HIMMELBLAU: Would it be possible in the next three or four weeks so we can see what the bad debt situation is in the EMS system.

NITCHOLAS: Yes, we'll be glad to give you the total receivables of the bad debts that are associated with it. But when we do actually record revenues we record a reduced amount of what we actually bill based on the percentage of collection.

The next schedule, Schedule VI, is a computer acquisition fund. This was a special project fund that was set up to purchase a computer, an additional computer, and a method to fund that. Some monies were used in Vehicle Services and the General Fund contributed \$304,000 to buy the computer....we bought the computer. We spent about \$28,000 less than we originally anticipated in the original budget. But that fund will not be an on-going fund like a normal operating fund would be.

The last schedule in this group is the Medical Assistance Fund, that's Schedule VII. It was established right near the end of the year to set up the Medical Assistance Program for this year that we're in now, and it was funded for that short period of time to a tune of about \$48,000. The \$5,000 was from the General Fund, and \$43,000 was from the Hospital Fund which in essence was a flow-through. But that fund was established and had very little activity because it was right at the end of the year.

I would like now to go into the Non-Utility Enterprise Funds. These probably will not take as long. The schedules are pretty self-explanatory I think. We hope, by the way that this format will be easier for you to grasp because it does set it out very similar to what the budget does except in summary form. This group of funds actually includes the hospital, the airport, the auditorium, the convention center and the golf fund. It is what we call business activities that are not utility, but they are business activities the City is involved in and they're not normally always true governmental functions. We again have a financial overview of all the funds thrown together in one schedule and that's on Schedule I. It shows that revenue is produced from sales and services and by special taxation which is the hotel occupancy tax with \$3,300 above the original estimate in the budget. They covered 87% of the operating contractual cost of these particular activities. These costs were \$472,000 below the original budget figures. So, overall, in the Non-Utility Enterprise Funds, those funds we

mentioned earlier, we were \$472,000 under budget. Original estimates had provided that revenues produced would cover 74.5% of the operating contractual cost and instead they covered 87%. The direct subsidy of these funds by the General Government estimated in the budget is \$8,000,000. The final analysis of this subsidy requirement was approximately \$5.2 million which is \$2.8 million less than was anticipated. In addition the ending available balance in the two funds not requiring subsidies, and those funds being the airport and the auditorium; they grew from an estimated \$316,000 to just over one million dollars, which is an increase of \$683,000. So their financial condition has improved. Now, looking at the individual funds, each one of the individual funds... First, we'll take the Hospital Fund, that's in Schedule II. Revenues total \$21.5 million. They exceeded the original budget projection by almost \$3,000,000... \$2.9 million. Operating contractual costs of \$225.9 million, almost \$26 million, were \$398,000 under the original estimate. So the expenditures of the hospital were \$398,000 under what the original budget was.

HIMMELBLAU: Is this a first for the hospital in many years, Monty?

NITCHOLAS: Well, I think this is probably the best we've been in several years in the hospital. Even though we've funded increased inventories of \$425,000, the necessary General Fund subsidy was reduced \$2.8 million.....from an estimated \$7.7 million to \$4.9 million.

COOKE: I'd like to see what the last five years of General Fund subsidy has been to the hospital..just for a trend.

NITCHOLAS: Sure, we can get that.

COOKE: If I could get that at a later time. I think all of us would like that.

NITCHOLAS: We'll have it late in January. We'll provide that to the Council. The next schedule is Schedule III...the Airport Fund. When looking at the financial highlights of the Airport Fund, we see that revenues totalled \$1.9 million, almost \$2 million. That was \$270,000 above what was originally estimated in the original budget. Operating and capital costs, the amount of capital costs, such as office equipment, that type of thing, were \$26,000 above the original budget. They did exceed what was originally budgeted. They did not exceed what was approved to budget during the year, but they did exceed the original budget by \$26,000. This produced a net income without considering appreciation as a factor of \$558,000 from the operation of the facility. The ending balance, originally estimated at \$172,000 now stands at \$553,000 on September 30th and that's due to the operating income and to a less than anticipated transfer to the general and capital projects fund that were projected in the original budget. We didn't have to have the money transfer that we had originally anticipated. The ending balance provides of course an improved reserve in the, or fund balance, in the Airport Fund for possibility of future improvements to the facility.

MULLEN: None of this is transferred into the General Fund?

NITCHOLAS: No, sir. We had originally anticipated \$120,000 to go to the General Fund in the original budget. I don't recall what the specific purpose of that \$120,000 was in the budget, but we did not transfer any money.

MULLEN: I thought there was supposed to be a transfer, as I remember correctly. Hadn't we done that in the past?

NITCHOLAS: At times. We have not done it as a rule there has not been a transfer into the Airport Fund. I think some years ago there may have been some, but the last few years we have not, unless there was a specific purpose.

MULLEN: Who made the decision on that point to not...

NITCHOLAS: To not transfer? Actually the decision was just, I guess was just not made whether to transfer or not. The need was not there.

DAN DAVIDSON: I think it was just the reverse. In the years Mr. Nitcholas was talking about there was a decision at the request of the Council to do so as opposed to deciding not to do it this year.

MULLEN: What I'm trying to find out is was there, in the original budget that we approved, transfer from the Airport Fund to the General Fund?

DAVIDSON: I don't believe so but we'll double check.

MULLEN: I would like to double check that. The reason I'm asking is because we're talking about the...

DAVIDSON: Daron Butler's here, I didn't realize that...

BUTLER: When you approved the 77-78 budget we had put in a transfer from the Airport Fund to the General Fund \$120,000 or \$200,000. I don't remember the exact number. When we presented the proposed budget to you in August in one of the overview sessions we noted that we were not recommending that transfer at that point because there was no necessity for it. The General Fund was healthy. We felt like the Airport would need it in its capital needs and we pointed that out at that time.

MULLEN: The reason I asked that question is because out selling the bonds I make the point that they really help pay for themselves. If we don't have a transfer from this fund to the General Fund, then that's not a true statement.

BUTLER: If the airport bonds are paying for themselves...

MULLEN: Help pay for themselves, not totally.

BUTLER: If they did, we would transfer from the Airport Fund to the General Obligation Debt Retirement Fund and I think that at some point is a policy decision that the Council might make on that particular fund in the next budget process.

MULLEN: You can do it either way...reduction in the needs for the General Fund still is a reduction in property tax....

BUTLER: It does help.

MULLEN: So it's the same thing I'm talking about.

BUTLER: I agree with you completely, Mr. Mullen.

MULLEN: I would favor seeing it going back to the General Fund...that \$120,000, and if it hasn't been done, I would favor seeing it done. And I think as for selling the bonds if people understand that one segment is making a profit, it's helping the General Fund, it's helping to reduce property tax...maybe we can check and see what it's costing the taxpayer each year for the bonds at the airport at the present time.

BUTLER: That's a reasonable request and one we can comply with reasonably, I believe.

DAVIDSON: We'll do some calculation on that and come back and show you what the result would be if you want to pursue that.

MULLEN: One of the questions is, why should I, as a taxpayer, help support the airport for the people that use it. It's a valid question and I don't think it's all that valid because it's for the whole community, just like a lot of services we have. But if this is one segment that can help pay for itself I would favor seeing it do so.

BUTLER: One aspect of it is there is \$580,000 projected in current revenue out of the airport which is "profit" that goes to the Capital Improvements program for projects so we do not have to borrow, so we do have that profit margin right there.

DAVIDSON: One thing that has changed. It used to be that the City's General Fund had to support the operating costs at the airport. And now that's self-supporting.

MULLEN: I think it's just doing a fantastic, amazing, wonderful job at the airport. Don't misunderstand me.

DAVIDSON: You know, I am answering the same type of question from people and that is a point I have been trying to make that the airport is on a much sounder fiscal footing than it ever has been.

MULLEN: Very sound.

MAYOR: It certainly has a tremendous impact on the economic well-being of the city.

MULLEN: Right.

NITCHOLAS: I think the airport, just like any other accounting entity needs to maintain some reserve. That reserve needs to be determined by the Council. And if it's determined that \$500,000 is too much then that money can be transferred, any time that you desire, to the General Fund or to the Debt Service Fund directly.

MULLEN: Do you think we could have that in the next week?

NITCHOLAS: Yes, sir. O.K., the next to the last fund scheduled for Auditorium and Convention Center...operating revenues in this fund were up \$38,500 from the original estimates. The hotel occupancy tax receipts were \$79,000 over the initial budget providing for \$1.3 million in new resources to the fund. Operating costs were well below the original budget estimate, totalling \$612,000 as compared to a budget figure of \$719,000. Transfers out were similar to planned amounts except the amount provided to the Paramount Theatre, and I think I've probably talked to you all about this before where you approved it in the previous year, or you approved it for the previous year. It came in through the fund balance. We actually just transferred it for the fund balance during this past year. It netted out to the same thing. The variable ending balance of \$447,000 in the Auditorium Fund reflects an improved position over the budget figure of \$144,000. Decreased available balance from the beginning of the year to the end of the year for the most part is that Paramount Theatre contribution. It got mixed up between the two years.

In the last fund, the last schedule, the Golf Fund, it simply says that the outcome was very close to the original budget. Revenues were \$3,700 more than estimated and costs were \$7,200 more than originally budgeted. As a result, the General Fund subsidy had to be increased to \$262,000 in order to finance a cash flow in the fund.

The City of Austin, in my opinion, is truly in the best financial position that I've seen it in since I've been here and since I can recollect from the records that we have. We're in real good financial position from a cash basis and an over all financial position. Any other questions?

COOKE: I'd just like to echo that and say that I would certainly hope the citizens of Austin would concentrate and look at these particular entities as they make decisions regarding our financial picture and specifically in regard to the bond election Saturday. It is unfortunate that we have so much deliberation about how bad a situation we're in or potentially could be in and no one is looking actually at what the figures are and that's very disappointing.

MULLEN: What's the bottom line? Net bottom line. Do we end up, bottom line, with more than we expected?

NITCHOLAS: Oh, yes.

MULLEN: I know we did. How much?

NITCHOLAS: Well, I don't have the Utility Funds put together yet. One of the reasons I break these into groups is so we can look at like situations. One reason I break the Utility Fund away from the other enterprise funds is because these other enterprise funds, the hospital, golf, airport....are dependent on the Government to some extent. Utility Fund is not. So, I guess you could mesh these two groups together and have some type of....

MULLEN: How much less did it cost from the General Government last year than budgeted?

NITCHOLAS: As far as expenditures?

MULLEN: Right.

MAYOR: Putting it in another way too, you know, percentages. We've heard tremendous discussion in the community of overrun and where over spending is and that's in a few departments and we have 30 departments that have underspent their budget. And overall in that General Fund we were 9.3% under budget. Isn't that correct?

NITCHOLAS: I've seen that figure. I'm not sure I know what that figure represents but I think that's right. I don't know what all that includes. Over all, in the General Government Operating Funds, let me give you this figure first and then I'll go back and give you the Enterprise Funds. The actual expenditures were budgeted at \$79.9 million...were budgeted originally, and the actual expenditure was \$78.4 million. That doesn't include transfers. That's the operating and manner of capital costs of all of those funds.

DAVIDSON: \$1.1 million.

NITCHOLAS: \$1.4 million.

DAVIDSON: I misunderstood you.

MULLEN: What he said would be \$1.5 million.

NITCHOLAS: O.K., I rounded them off...I have longer numbers. That includes the General fund, the General Obligation Debt Service Fund, the Transit Fund, the EMS Fund, Computer Acquisition Fund and the Medical Assistance Fund. Those Governmental Funds. The cost in the Enterprise Funds excluding the Utility... they were budgeted at \$29.4 million and the actual expenditure was \$28.9 million, which is just less than a half a million dollars difference....underspent. Overall that's those four funds that are....

MULLEN: So the total will be \$2 million better off than projected.

NITCHOLAS: No, that's not a true statement. Those are the expenditures. Revenues were also exceeded considerably.

MULLEN: It's not so important that more money came in, that's not something we can control, but the important thing is that the City staff and through good government and management came in \$2 million less than projected for expenditures. Is that a true statement?

NITCHOLAS: It could be more than that. These are in all the areas except the Utilities.

MULLEN: Expenses couldn't be less no matter what the Utility System is. It could be less on the Utility side, in addition to that, but not in the General Government area.

NITCHOLAS: If we are talking about the General Government area, your statement is true. Total expenditures for operation and minor capital outlay, including the operation is that figure that you just quoted...\$2 million.

COOKE: You have to roll in the Utility too as far as the whole budget is concerned.... (fade away, he did not have mike turned on)

NITCHOLAS: That's correct.

DAVIDSON: We'll get that to you.

MULLEN: It's a shame that this type thing will not be seen or heard by many. Only where a few departments ran over that we questioned...

DAVIDSON: I have a lot of fun you know, telling groups when I go out to speak, I say, you know you may be surprised to know that there is not \$31,000,000 missing on Fayette..the project is under budget, it's on schedule and it's going to save the ratepayers money. And there is a lot of misunderstanding about this kind of thing, but this City does have a good financial operation and as indicated ten days ago, it's going to improve considerably with our ability to recall information quickly under that new accounting system that has been authorized by the City Council. I too wish that could get out, Mr. Mullen. That constitutes our report, Mayor and Council. We have nothing else.

MAYOR: Thank you, Mr. Nitcholas. I think that's a point well made on that General Government area. \$2 million under what was budgeted last year, under what was originally budgeted.

MULLEN: We underspent...two million dollars...underspent on the budget.

DAVIDSON: Good news!

MULLEN: Good news doesn't make the press...due to a good City Manager and fiscal conservatism we have come under budget by \$2,000,000.

DAVIDSON: Frugality on the part of the City Council...protecting the citizens' interests and not spending everything we can get our hands on.

COOKE: That will be on Page F-16 behind the classified section.

#### VISUAL CORRIDORS

Mayor McClellan and Mayor Pro Tem Cooke presented an item to request the Sign Committee to report on an ordinance to preserve visual corridors to the Capitol.

Mayor Pro Tem Cooke moved that the Council refer to the Sign Committee and the Planning Commission a request for a report on an ordinance to preserve visual corridors to the Capitol. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Mayor Pro Tem Cooke

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Snell



## DISCH FIELD LIGHTING FOR INAUGURAL

Councilmember Trevino moved that the Council waive the City policy of 11:00 p.m. curfew on use of lights at Disch Field to allow lights to remain on until 2:00 a.m., January 17, 1979, in conjunction with the Governor's Inaugural Ball at the Auditorium, and waived the fee for lighting. The motion, seconded by Mayor McClellan, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Mayor  
Pro Tem Cooke

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmembers Himmelblau,  
Snell, Goodman

## BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor McClellan announced the following Board and Commission appointments will be made January 11, 1979:

MH/MR - 1  
Wrecker Standards Commission - 4  
Medical Assistance Advisory Council - 3  
Construction Advisory Committee - 4  
Human Relations Commission - 7  
Dental Health Advisory Council - 2  
On-Going of Goals Committee - 6

The Mayor announced the following Boards and Commissions appointments to be made January 18, 1979:

Elisabet Ney Museum - 7  
MH/MR Public Responsibility Committee - 3  
Board of Adjustment - 3  
Heating, Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Appeals Board - 2  
Library Commission - 7  
Manpower Advisory Planning Council - 1  
Citizen's Traffic Safety Commission - 5  
Urban Transportation Commission - 5  
Energy Conservation Commission - 1

## RECESS

Council recessed its meeting at 11:50 a.m. and resumed its meeting at 2:20 p.m. Mayor Pro Tem Cooke was absent.

## PUBLIC HEARING ON NATIONAL ELECTRIC CODE

Mayor McClellan opened the public hearing set for 2:00 p.m. to consider adoption of the 1978 National Electric Code as amended into Chapter 37 of the City Code as recommended by the Electric Board. Mr. Lonnie Davis, Building Inspection Director, expressed appreciation to the Electric Board for their time in studying the ordinance and stated the Board of Builders approves the ordinance. No one appeared to be heard.

Mayor McClellan introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 37 OF THE 1967 CODE OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN BY ADOPTING THE 1978 NATIONAL ELECTRIC CODE (NFPA NO. 70-1978), DELETING CERTAIN ARTICLES FROM SAID CODE; REWORDING SECTION 37-4; ESTABLISHING WIRE COVERING COLOR REQUIREMENTS; ESTABLISHING GROUNDING METHODS; REPEALING SECTION 37-32; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council close the public hearing, waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Mullen, Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan,  
Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Pro Tem Cooke

## ADJOURNMENT

Council adjourned its meeting at 2:25 p.m.

APPROVED

*Carol Keeton McClellan*  
Mayor

ATTEST:

*Grace Monroe*

City Clerk